



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of *Conny-Catching* a possible clue to the authorship of the *Defense of Conny-Catching*. Why he ignores Grosart's suggestion (Greene, *Works*, I. 131), which seems to fit in well with his own, it is hard for an outsider to see. One may ask too, why has Ben Jonson's *Alchemist* been so nearly ignored, or for that matter his *Bartholomew Fair*. Is not Doll a "shee-conny-catcher", Subtle a "hee-conny-catcher", and Face a "verser"? And has not Hathaway in his critical edition of the *Alchemist* given just that historical background to the conny-catchers in alchemy, which Mr. Aydelotte is giving to others? A further question, hesitantly. May not Reginald Scot have owed something of his impulsion to Harman? He must have known the *Caveat*. He went at things in a way not unlike.

Mr. Aydelotte has written an excellent monograph. He has made brilliant use of his materials. He has done more: he has caught the deeper significances of his subject. Moreover he handles with ease and lightness what may be called the English of Oxford.

WALLACE NOTESTEIN.

The House of Lords in the Reign of William III. By A. S. TURBERVILLE. [Oxford Historical and Literary Studies, issued under the Direction of C. H. Firth and Walter Raleigh, Professors of Modern History and English Literature in the University of Oxford, vol. III.] (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1913. Pp. vi, 264.)

THE structure and the development of English government have been the subject of an immense literature, but relatively some parts of the subject have been neglected. Anglo-Saxon organization, the beginnings of English law, the rise of Parliament, and the history of the House of Commons have been dealt with specially and at length. On the other hand the history of the executive and of the departments in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been scantily dealt with, and comparatively little has been written about the House of Lords. Since the *Reports on the Dignity of a Peer*, published 1820-1829, the number of authoritative works includes scarcely more than Pike's *Constitutional History of the House of Lords* (1894) and Professor Firth's *House of Lords during the Civil War* (1910). An exhaustive account of some part of the subject, therefore, may be cordially welcomed.

The author's study is made at first hand from the sources. The basis must necessarily be the official records of the house supplemented by the scanty debates yielded by various *Collections* or which patient research discovers at wide random. In this particular period, however, the author is able to supplement the *Lords Journals* with the ampler and far more interesting "Minutes", which as *Manuscripts of the House of Lords* have been published by the Historical Manuscripts Commission down to 1693, and independently through the year 1702. It is this

material, thoroughly examined, which enables the author to make his distinctive contribution. In addition, abundant use has been made of correspondence and contemporary writings, although it is the opinion of the reviewer that something more might have been obtained from the pamphlets and that a little would have been found in the State Papers Domestic and in the miscellaneous manuscripts of the period. It may be observed that the author has confined himself almost entirely to the use of printed sources.

The first chapters describe the membership of the house, and also the social position of the peerage, the parliamentary privileges of the members, and their procedure when acting as a high court. The remainder, the larger part of the volume, deals with the influence of the Lords in the "Aristocratic Revolution", the "Interregnum", and the "Settlement", and then details the principal measures with regard to which they took action. Here the author's account is narrative rather than synthetic, and becomes more of an excellent commentary upon important political events than a work upon constitutional development. Such matters as the relations of Lords and Commons, the relations of Lords with king and ministry and cabinet, the participation of Parliament in foreign affairs, the relative importance and initiative of Lords and Commons with regard to legislation, all of these things are dealt with, sometimes with apparent fullness, but usually the treatment is inadequate as compared with what the author has previously written upon tenure and privilege, and sometimes they have to be deduced by the reader himself. On the other hand it is precisely because of this method that there is such an admirable account of the dominant part taken by the peers in the Revolution of 1688, of the work of the Tories in procuring the Act of Settlement and the Hanoverian Succession, and of the solidarity of the Lords, which for this period makes necessary, as he suggests, a study of the relations between the two houses rather than the relations of Whigs and Tories. A serviceable bibliography and an adequate index bring the volume to a close.

The book is free from errors: though it is not true that the temporal peers became the preponderant power because the higher clergy began to meet in convocation (p. 1), nor is it well to speak of the end of the seventeenth century as "the days of a feudal aristocracy" (p. 177). I have noticed only one misprint ("Auchitell" should be Anchitell, p. 94, note 1). The method in chapter III. is probably less good than the author intended; in the references there is not invariable uniformity. Although there are in the composition not a few such expressions as are wont to arouse in the author's countrymen wondering scorn and patronage when they are reviewing that which is written outside of their country, the book is generally readable, and the writing improves decidedly in vigor and clearness as the narrative proceeds. Altogether the volume is a contribution to the subject, and a worthy number of the series in which it stands.

EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER.